

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-13 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1-3 and 5-10 have been amended, and new claims 11-13 have been added.

§112 Rejection of Claim 6

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As noted above claim 6 has been amended, thereby obviating the rejection to claim 6. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claim 6 based upon 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been obviated and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-8

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rangan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,154,771; hereinafter referred to as "Rangan"). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Regarding claim 1, as shown above, claim 1 has been amended and calls for:

1. A transmitting method comprising steps of:
 - multiplexing a signal of a picture including a selectable object with information relevant to the selectable object in the picture; and
 - transmitting the multiplexed picture signal;

wherein a visible symbol to which reference is made when selecting the selectable object is presented in the picture corresponding to the selectable object,
the relevant information indicates display content, a zooming start position, and a zooming end position, and
when the selectable object is selected by referring to the symbol, the display content is displayed on a screen by zooming in according to the zooming start position and the zooming end position.

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, a signal of a picture including a selectable object is multiplexed with relevant information corresponding to the selectable object. The relevant information indicates display content, a zooming start position, and a zooming end position. When the selectable object is selected, the display content is displayed by zooming in using the zooming start position and zooming end position. Therefore, the multiplexed signal includes the picture and includes the relevant information indicating the display content and the start and end position for zooming in to display the display content.

Considering the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 in Sections 7 and 9 of the Office Action as applied to amended claim 1, it does not appear that the arguments presented by the Examiner in rejecting claim 1 over Rangan in Sections 7 and 9 of the Office Action establish how Rangan shows or suggests amended claim 1. In Section 7, the Examiner appears to argue that Rangan shows a "selectable object having displayable annotation/hotspot and its associated URL" and therefore shows claim 1. However, in amended claim 1, the relevant information for the selectable object indicates display content to be displayed and indicates the start and end positions for zooming in to display that display content. Even assuming that the displayable annotation of Rangan did show display content as relevant information for a selectable object, the Examiner has not explained how Rangan shows that the relevant information indicates the start and end positions for zooming in to show the display content. The information defining a

hotspot or displayable annotation does not necessarily include a zooming start position and zooming end position. Furthermore, even assuming that zooming in were well known, zooming does not inherently include using a zooming start position and end position defined in relevant information as called for in claim 1. To establish that Rangan anticipates claim 1, it is submitted that the Examiner needs to show how Rangan teaches the relevant information as called for in claim 1. Without further explanation by the Examiner, it is submitted that the Examiner has not established how Rangan shows or suggests this aspect of claim 1.

Accordingly, it does not appear that the Examiner has established how Rangan, as referenced by the Examiner in rejecting claim 1, shows or suggests at least these aspects of amended claim 1, and so it is submitted that the Examiner has not established how Rangan shows or suggests amended claim 1 as a whole. Claims 2-6 and 11 depend from claim 1, and it is also submitted that the Examiner has not established how Rangan shows or suggests claims 2-6 and 11, through their dependence on claim 1. Similar arguments apply to claims 7 and 8, and so to claims 9 and 12 that depend from claim 7, and to claims 10 and 13 that depend from claim 8.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-4 and 7-8 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Rangan, as presented and referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4 and 7-8 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 5-6 and 9-10

In Section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5-6 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan. This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, it is submitted that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection to claims 5 and 6 has also been overcome through the dependence of claims 5 and 6 on claim 1.

Claim 9 depends from claim 7. As discussed above, it is submitted that the rejection to claim 7 has been overcome. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection to claim 9 has also been overcome through the dependence of claim 9 on claim 7.

Claim 10 depends from claim 8. As discussed above, it is submitted that the rejection to claim 8 has been overcome. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection to claim 10 has also been overcome through the dependence of claim 10 on claim 8.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 5-6 and 9-10 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Rangan, as presented and referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 5-6 and 9-10 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claims 11, 12, and 13 depend from claims 1, 7, and 8, respectively. As discussed above, it is submitted that the rejections to claims 1, 7, and 8 have been overcome, and so it is submitted that these rejections would not apply to new claims 11, 12, and 13.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-13 is respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:


Hans R. Mahr, Reg. No. 46,138 for

William S. Frommer

Reg. No. 25,506

(212) 588-0800